

**SECRET**

V. Nesal'sky

Thursday Oct. 22, 1964

Address Columbia University International House, room 753

Lives in Moscow USSR. Student of American History after world war 2.  
Geographical data:  
Born in Ukraine, lived in Ukraine for 3 years, (Kiev) moved to Siberia where he  
lived for 11 years in Tomsk. Present residence Moscow.  
Mother Ukrainian father Russian. Has many relatives in Ukraine. Member of CPSU

Personal description:

Height 5'8"

Weight 150-155 Lbs.

Hair black combed back

Eyes are faded grey or light blue, nose straight, high cheekbones, teeth front  
straight on top slightly protruding. ears flat, average size, complexion of  
tears dark, no scars or marks.

Hands average amount of hair, dark, long fingers, skin,

body slim, well built, no deformities visible.

Personal characteristics:

Dressed in Brown suit, white shirt, red tie with tie clasp with red stone in  
middle. Wears black shoes, smokes Marlboro cigarettes, in the American style  
holding the cigarette between middle and index finger, talks in an ~~over~~  
exaggerated manner, using his hands quite a bit, in some of his expressions  
uses his face and laughs to impress a point.

The meeting took place in the lobby of the international house on Thursday  
Oct. 22, 1964. He came down at 2:00 P.M. (the arranged time). I introduced myself,  
and we went into the lobby.

Topics:

1. Columbia University: I asked N. how he liked Columbia University and what he  
thought of the educational system. He said that Columbia is a very fine institution  
and he is very glad to be a part of it. He said that he is a student of American History  
concentrating on the post war period and in the Progressive party in American life.  
He said that the progressive party is the only example of a third party trying  
to change in the American political scene. I asked him how he liked America. He said  
that he had an idea of what America would be like before he came here. He said that  
it did not fully meet up with his expectations. He said that before he came to the  
U.S. he saw films of life in the states, he said that he was disappointed with the  
number of unemployed and starving people. I said that this is present in every country  
in the world, including his own. He said that in his country there is no unemployment  
and people do not starve. He asked me where I was from and what school do I attend,  
I answered that I was a student of history specializing in Soviet Union history.

2. Ukraine. I asked N. about his background. He told me his biography and then I asked  
him what nationality he was. He said that he was Ukrainian. I asked if he had ever been  
in Ukraine, he said yes, he had been to Kiev, Dnipropetrovsk, and Dniprodonetsk,  
and that he had a lot of relatives living in Ukraine. He said that he had been to  
Kiev after the war and said that it is a very beautiful city, with nice buildings  
and nice trees. I told him that some of my friends had been to Kiev this past summer  
at that point he said in and said that they probably said that nobody speaks Ukrainian  
in Kiev, I said yes that was what they told me. He laughed and said that that must  
have been a lie on the part of my friends. I said that my friends have no reason to  
lie about such matters. He then said that they must have been to Kiev during the  
tourist period, and at time of year there are many Russians in Kiev. I told him that  
this was nonsense. He then said that there are many Russians living in Kiev, and the  
languages are very similar. He said that when he was in Kiev he could not

**SECRET**

122 Oct

~~SECRET~~

understand a single word of what was being said because all the signs on the railroads and all the time schedules were in Ukrainian. I asked him if there was any discrimination of Ukrainian and Russians. He said no not at all. I told him that this was strange to me considering what my friends have told me. He said that the best thing was for me to go and visit Ukraine for myself, and find out. He said that he knew that in the Ukraine there has always been a strong feeling of nationalism, and he understood this feeling very well. But he could not understand what good it would do to Ukraine to separate from the USSR. He said that the people in Ukraine were happy now.

Change in the Soviet Government: I asked him what he thought of the recent change in the government of the Soviet Union. He said that Khruschev was getting old and it is a normal process to change leadership in a country. I asked him if he thought that Brezhnev would be as good or better than Khruschev. He said that Khruschev made some mistakes when he was in power, and that the new government would try to improve these缺点. I asked him if you could call the regime of Khruschev a "personality cult" or not, not in the meaning it had for the time of Stalin. I asked him about the time of Stalin, he started to praise the good deeds of Stalin's time, how he put industry in its feet, and how he worked to better the people to raise them from the depths of czarism. I asked him about the purges of Stalin, he said that they happened during the latter part of his regime. He told me that his comrade had been arrested by the NKVD for no charge and sent away for two years. He said that after Stalin went crazy and arrested people on suspicion. I asked him why Khruschev was finally removed, he said that he didn't know but he trusts the leaders of the party and said that he will be told in the near future. I asked him how. He said that after some changes take place in the government all the members of the party are sent letters about the changes where everything is explained to them, then in a few weeks the people are told. I asked him why is it that the people are always the last to know about these changes. He said that it would be anarchy to consult the whole country about such matters. He said that the central committee had its reasons for the change, and it was not up to him to question the policy of the Central Committee. I asked him about the editorial in Pravda about calling Khruschev a hairbrained schemer, and a loudmouth. He said that it was probably true. He said that party discipline required him to follow the decisions of party policy and not to question it. I asked him about Brezhnev and what he thought about him. He said that Brezhnev was a good man and that he is qualified to run the communist party. I asked him about the removal of Al and Adzubel from his post as the editor of Izvestia. He said that Adzubel was a good man, but he refused to answer the question that I put to him.

Defectors: He said that I had a wrong idea of life in the Soviet Union. He said that we in America always looked on the sunny sides of life in the USSR. He said that all we think about is the KGB and defectors. He said "I'll tell you something about defectors, I used to know Nureva (Ballot dancer) he acted very badly, all the people in the Soviet Union hate him for what he did, he received his education in the USSR, we paid for it and then he decided to make some money and left us, nobody taught that the Americans (he defected in Britain) would pay him well and could use him for anti soviet propaganda. He was a coward and all the defectors are in this category! At this point he was quite worked up and displayed a lot of anger. I told him that the defectors could not be all cowards and that there must be a reason for all the defections. I also said that the most defections are from the state security agencies. He said that the only reasons for the existence of the KGB are to catch spy spies. He did not comment about the defections from the KGB.

Military in the USSR: I asked the subject about the military in the USSR, and he said that he did not know much about it.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Armenian in the liberation of Ukraine, and he was given a very important role. At today in the Soviet Ukrainian press he wasn't even mentioned in the ceremonies. I did not comment on this. I asked him about the fact that in Soviet history books there is always a tendency to criticise Ukrainian nationalism, but there are never any attacks on Russian nationalism. N. said that there is no need to write about Ukrainian nationalism because there never was any. I said that there is no need to bring out the truth in Russian history. N. seemed embarrassed and had at this statement. And I decided not to press the issue.

At this time I decided that it was time to leave, and told him that I have to go. I walked me to Riverside church, and there I asked him if we could meet again. He said that we have nothing in common and that there is nothing to talk about. I said that this is too bad and we parted.